

SHADOW MANAGEMENT

Eugen BURDUȘ

The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, Romania

ABSTRACT

Almost always poor results obtained by an organization is considered to be the result of incompetence of those who perform functions of managers or members of participatory management bodies, taking bad decisions with adverse effects for that organization. Assumption is only partially correct and in some cases, because those people, although agreed to hold certain positions of leadership, in reality they do not influence decision choosing, so the quality of decisions within the organization. Quality of decisions and consequently the performance of the organization are the result of preparation, competence, thoroughness, commitment to the organization, especially the responsibility of the other personae who are not responsible for the management, but actually leading that organization, which means that a practice "shadow management".

Although it is recognized by most theorists and even by practitioners of management interdependence between formal and informal organization within the organization, in reality very little investigated, which results in a series of wrong conclusions about the causes of negative results of work organizations. It believes that for the weaknesses of the organization are responsible only the members of the participatory management bodies and/or managers in various management positions, because they are the only ones who have power in decision making, thus influencing the positive or negative results.

A deeper research on how decisions taken in many organizations of our country highlights spectacular issues concerning the dichotomy between on the one hand, the influence (power) that have some people who do not occupy management positions, therefore have no responsibility for the results of the decisions application and, on the other hand, the responsibility of managers and/or components of management bodies for the effects of decision application, but who have very little influence in choosing the decision to be applied. This discrepancy, which unfortunately is perpetuated within organizations, leads, to the disastrous results for organizational in particular and society in general.

Obviously the question arises, why people who hold management positions in an organization that supports their decisions to be decisively influenced by others within or outside that organization? The answers to such questions are very different, because the relations between the people involved are very different, because it is based on situations and different interests.

For example, where management functions are obtained through an election process conducted by staff members, the likelihood that some people who have an interest in influencing decisions to be taken in that Although it is recognized by most theorists and even by practitioners of management interdependence between formal and informal organization within the organization,

in reality very little investigated, which results in a series of wrong conclusions about the causes of negative results of work organizations. It believes that for the weaknesses of the organization are responsible only the members of the participatory management bodies and/or managers in various management positions, because they are the only ones who have power in decision making, thus influencing the positive or negative results.

A deeper research on how decisions taken in many organizations of our country highlights spectacular issues concerning the dichotomy between on the one hand, the influence (power) that have some people who do not occupy management positions, therefore have no responsibility for the results of the decisions application and, on the other hand, the responsibility of managers and/or components of management bodies for the effects of decision application, but who have very little influence in choosing the decision to be applied. This discrepancy, which unfortunately is perpetuated within organizations leads, to the disastrous results for organizations in particular and society in general.

Obviously the question arises, why people who hold management positions in an organization that supports their decisions to be decisively influenced by others within or outside that organization? The answers to such questions are very different, because the relations between the people involved are very different, because it is based on situations and different interests.

For example, where management functions are obtained through an election process conducted by staff members, the likelihood that some people who have an interest in influencing decisions to be taken in that organizational, influence the choice of managers is very high. Or, if the employment of management functions is by appointment from persons or collective, who have the power of appointment to these functions, will want to force people who can handle them easily, because of their faithfulness, or a concern for the discovery of a possible lack of competence in the field of business. Examples may continue with other cases that generate the imposition of management positions of people, often incompetent, but sometimes with management potential, but does not exploit it for reasons of extortion that can be exercised over them. Thus, deficiencies in the management of an organization may find its roots in the process of empowering managers based in an organization.

It can recognize in this process the influence of informal groups (formed on the basis of common interest, often related to the operation of the organization's resources for personal interests) and the formal process of empowerment of people management functions that contribute to shaping formal structure of the organization. This has a negative influence on the performance of the organization, because the gap between informal groups of members' interests and the interests of the organization.

Whatever the causes of the discrepancy between, on the one hand, the power to make decisions, informal transferred to non-management positions have, so that will influence *'from the shadow'* decision-making and, on the other hand, they who have formal responsibility under job description, and who serves as manager, this situation will almost always lead to negative results management

process. Those who lose in such situations are the components of the organizations that make such a "*shadow management*".

Due to the influence of those who have pursued a "*shadow management*" on the election or appointment to the management functions of different people, they themselves will feel obliged to put them into practice interests. Formal acceptance by managers of such manipulations is determined by "melting" of managerial responsibility in the collective participatory management body to which they belong. And for some management functions, which are provided individual occupant of job responsibilities, acceptance of such manipulation is encountered especially when liability is not very well defined and correlated with the power conferred by empowering in that management function.

"*Shadow management*" is, in most cases, a negative phenomenon of management organizations, because the interests of decision makers do not correspond with the interests of any organization or individual interests of the constituents of that organization. Apart from the fact that these people will only follow their own interests, which do not correspond with the interests of the organization, in many situations because of personal frustration, they seek to hinder the achievement of fundamental objectives of the organization to make up for not recognizing the qualities by the members of that organization. We can imagine the negative effects of decisions taken by those who practice a "*shadow management*" and determine the destiny of the organization.

I said that in most cases the effects of such a "*shadow management*" are negative, but not always, because there may be cases, unfortunately, very few in which the influence of such people is in favor of the organization, but only when such people who influence the management processes are in good faith and seek with their own interests the general interests of the organization. But such cases are exceptions that would not justify the promotion of such a management practice, which is not transparent in the category of those who have and exercise their power of decision.

Lack of transparency of management processes and decision making processes in particular, with great influence over the organizations, this stage is one of the main causes of failure in the management of material resources, especially financial and human, at all levels of society and all organizations in the public domain. The phenomenon is less present in the private sector, as employer, who owns the resources of the organization's best interest to promote in the functions of managers only people who have the knowledge and skills required of those functions. Moreover, these managers rewarded primarily based on results and not so assigned status on the basis of the level of training, membership in a group with power of influence, etc.

The perpetuation of such a "*shadow management*" is possible in the Romanian society for various reasons, including:

➤ deficiencies in the structural organization, resulting in the drafting of job description of managers functions, the balance between non-related tasks, powers and responsibilities ("golden triangle of the organization"), in the sense that

these records are not given the powers but especially the responsibilities for each task;

- fierce desire of people less competent to drive, but who would not normally have opportunities to occupy positions of managers, coupled with the ability of others to profit from their incompetence behind to satisfy certain personal interests ;

- the phenomenon of "bird" of the management responsibility to the upper levels of the organization, especially to the bodies of participatory management body's in which responsibility is "melts" between all members of that body, even to its disappearance;

- reduced opportunities for certain persons to be elected or appointed officials managers, either because of shortages of skills and abilities, or, most often due to deficiencies of character, easy to grasp by those who have the power their election or appointment of those functions;

- the desire of some people to promote their own interests within the organization, which can be done more easily and securely through intermediaries (managers appointed and / or elected), then by their own decisions if that person would occupy management functions.

Here are just some of the causes of practicing a "*shadow management*" in organizations of any hierarchical level of society (government, ministries, companies etc.).

Unfortunately, the "*shadow management*" gives many people the opportunity to impose their own interests by manipulating those who occupy management positions without the risk of "*shadow people*" to answer for decisions that conflict with the interests of the organization, or why not, even with the interests of society as a whole. If these decisions are the result of a participatory management body (Board of Directors, Government, etc.), the risk is very low even for those who hold management positions. And if such a type of management is practiced in a social, political, legal ambiguity context, the responsibility be more dissipated and so we are witnessing a widespread to the practice of "*shadow management*", with all negative effects on the company or society in general.

"*Shadow management*" has negative effects not only through influencing the decisions of managers in that organization, but also because has negative influence on other components of the organization's management. For example, the structural organization will be influenced by:

- occupying criteria were not based on competence, the level and nature of training, but loyalty shown to those who handle the management functions;
- establishment of subdivisions based on personal goals of "*shadow managers*" not according to the priorities of the organization goals;
- primacy of informal relationships, to the detriment of formal relationships established among members of the organization;
- significant gaps between skills and responsibilities, for the first, to establish job descriptions for the positions of manager.

As regards information system, playing a "*shadow management*" due to adverse effects:

- ✓ development of information channels to the need of strict control of information by those who are "*in shadow*" of those who holding management positions or as a part of participatory management bodies;
- ✓ common manifestation of phenomena to avoid people who are not part of the group that controls the management of the organization;
- ✓ frequent presence filtering phenomena, which means misinformation of those who may refer some deficiencies in the effective operation of the organization.

From the methodological point of view, "*shadow management*" will promote the use of those methods, techniques and tools that can enhance managerial authoritarianism, can diminish employee participation in management processes to ensure the imposition of the interests of those who not occupy management positions, but actually lead the organization.

With regard to staff motivation, practice under a "*shadow management*", it will be more negative reasons, because of the frequency of reduce rewards, threats, while the staff will not help achieve the objectives, whether these objectives meet or not the interests of the organization.

Managers in an organization engaged in a "*shadow management*" will develop a culture of "family type" is distinguished by his *personal character*, which implies a direct relationship between the components of the organization, *hierarchy*, justified by the "father" authority, the head of family (manager) more than the "sons" (subordinates). In other words, develop an organizational culture *oriented to power*, where the manager is seen as a caring father, who knows more than subordinates and knows better what should be done.

All these adverse effects on components of the organization's management justified measures to be taken to avoid such a management, or where it is obvious, to remove it and switch to a transparent management, both for those within and outside the organization. A "*shadow management*" has adverse effects on the organization's relations with other organizations, because of ignorance of those who actually run that organization, so managers of other organizations may be placed in difficulty in achieving lasting relationship with that organization.

Bibliography

1. Ovidiu Nicolescu - "Redesigning the Human Resource Managerial Subsystem", in *Review of International Comparative Management*, Vol 9, No 4, Oct 2008
2. Marian Năstase - "Importance of Trust in the Knowledge Based Leadership", in *Review of International Comparative Management*, Vol 10, Issue 3, July 2009
3. Tudor Nistorescu, Cătălin M. Barbu - "Retail Store Design and Environment as Branding Support in the Services Marketing", in *Management & Marketing*, Year VI, No. 6/2008
4. Gh. Gh. Ionescu - "Cultural Caryatides of the Romanians Business Potential (The second part)", in *The Romanian Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol 1, No 2, Dec 2007
5. Eugen Burduș - "Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship", in *Review of International Comparative Management*, Vol 9, No 4, Oct 2008